UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/081,005	02/19/2002	Jeffrey R. Oar	10006644-1	1271

7590 11/30/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
PATEL, ANAND B	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2116	

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/081,005	OAR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Anand Patel	2116	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 February 2002*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *19 February 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-5, 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No 6271752 to Vaios.

- As per claim 1, Vaios discloses a method by which a computing system responds to an event that wakes the computing system from a sleep mode (304, 306), the method comprising the following steps:
    - Recognizing the event by the computing system (304; since there is only one monitoring device being used, the system always recognizes the event as an obstruction to the motion sensor)
    - Responding to the event by the computing system (306), including the following substeps:
        - Generating an event notification message (310), and
        - Transmitting the event notification message to an external device separate from the computing system (312), the transmitting being performed via wireless communication (6, 312); and,
    - Returning the computing system to the sleep mode (316)

- As per claim 2, Vaios discloses a method wherein the external device is a pager (312)
- As per claim 3, Vaios discloses a method wherein the event is an incoming call to the computing system (306)
- As per claim 4, Vaios discloses a method wherein the transmission is made by the computing system directly to the external device via a wireless network (312)
- As per claim 5, Vaios discloses a method wherein the transmission is made by the computing system to the external device via a wireless modem (column 2, lines 17-21; 6; Vaios teaches the use of a wireless communications network and the use of a computer network interface to connect to the communications network)
- As per claim 11, Vaios discloses storage media, the storage media storing software which when executing on a computing system performs a method by which the computing system responds to an event that wakes the computing system from a sleep mode (304, 306), the method comprising the following steps:
  - Recognizing the event by the computing system (304; since there is only one monitoring device being used, the system always recognizes the event as an obstruction to the motion sensor)
  - Responding to the event by the computing system (306), including the following substeps:
    - Generating an event notification message (310), and
    - Transmitting the event notification message to an external device separate from the computing system (312), the transmitting being performed via wireless communication (6, 312); and,

- Returning the computing system to the sleep mode (316)

- As per claim 12, Vaios discloses storage media wherein the external device is a pager (312)

- As per claim 13, Vaios discloses storage media wherein the event is an incoming call to the computing system (306)

- As per claim 14, Vaios discloses storage media wherein the transmission is made by the computing system directly to the external device via a wireless network (312)

- As per claim 15, Vaios discloses storage media wherein the transmission is made by the computing system to the external device via a wireless modem (column 2, lines 17-21; 6; Vaios teaches the use of a wireless communications network and the use of a computer network interface to connect to the communications network)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 6-7, 16-17, 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaios as applied above and in view of US Patent No 6772169 to Kaplan.

- As per claim 6, Vaios fails to disclose a method wherein the event is an inquiry from the external device. Kaplan discloses a method wherein

  - The event is an inquiry from the external device (column 2, lines 36-37); and

- The event notification message includes a response to the inquiry from the external device (column 2, lines 43-44).

  Kaplan discloses the use of a remote device to wirelessly access data stores in an application or on a web server. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Vaios and Kaplan to remotely query the video and image storage server disclosed by Vaios. The motivation to combine being the ability to access the data stored on the remote system allows the user to advantageously, wirelessly monitor and manage the system (column 1, lines 9-15). Another advantage is the ability to monitor multiple sites from one remote device (column 5, lines 7-11).

- As per claim 7, Vaios fails to disclose a method wherein the event is an access by the electronic device into a database. Kaplan, as applied above, discloses a method wherein the event is an access by the electronic device into a database within the computing system (column 4, lines 21-36).
- As per claim 16, Kaplan discloses storage media wherein
  - The event is an inquiry from the external device (column 2, lines 36-37); and
  - The event notification message includes a response to the inquiry from the external device (column 2, lines 43-44).
- As per claim 17, Kaplan discloses storage media wherein the event is an access by the electronic device into a database within the computing system (column 4, lines 21-36).
- As per claim 20, Vaios discloses a method performed by a computing system, the method comprising the following steps:

- Waking the computing system from a sleep mode upon receiving an event sent to the computing system from an external device (304; since there is only one monitoring device being used, the system always recognizes the event as an obstruction to the motion sensor)
- Responding to the event by the computing system (306), including the following substeps:
  - Generating an event notification message (310), and
  - Transmitting the event notification message to an external device separate from the computing system (312), the transmitting being performed via wireless communication (6, 312); and,
- Returning the computing system to the sleep mode (316)

Vaios fails to disclose that the event is an inquiry. Kaplan discloses a system, as discussed above, of querying a system from an external device (column 2, lines 36-37).

- As per claim 21, Kaplan discloses a method wherein the inquiry is an access by the electronic device into a database within the computing system (column 4, lines 21-36).
- As per claim 22, Vaios discloses a method wherein the external device is a pager (312).

5. Claims 8, 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaios as applied above and in view of US Patent No 6442248 to Davis.

- As per claim 8, Vaios fails to disclose an event that is a phone call. Davis discloses a method wherein
  - The event is an incoming phone call to the computing system (column 2, lines 27-28)

- The additional substep is included: providing a pop-up window that displays information pertaining to the phone call, the pop-up window being displayed to a user upon the user awakening the computing system (column 16, lines 3-8).

  It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Vaios and Davis to create a system that handles phone calls. The motivation to combine is the need to be able to identify the incoming telephone calls to the user (column 1, lines 33-37)

- As per claim 18, Vaios fails to disclose an event that is a phone call. Davis discloses storage media wherein
  - The event is an incoming phone call to the computing system (column 2, lines 27-28)
  - The additional substep is included: providing a pop-up window that displays information pertaining to the phone call, the pop-up window being displayed to a user upon the user awakening the computing system (column 16, lines 3-8).
- As per claim 19, Vaios discloses a method performed by a computing system, the method comprising the following steps:
  - Waking the computing system from a sleep mode upon receiving an event sent to the computing system from an external device (304; since there is only one monitoring device being used, the system always recognizes the event as an obstruction to the motion sensor)
  - Responding to the event by the computing system (306)
  - Returning the computing system to the sleep mode (316)

Vaios fails to disclose that the event is a phone call and that a pop-up window notifies the user of the caller's information. Davis discloses a system, as discussed above, of telephoning a computer (column 2, lines 27-28) and providing the pop-up window that displays information pertaining to the phone call, the pop-up window being displayed to a user upon the user awakening the computing system (column 16, lines 3-8).

6. Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaios as applied above and in view of US Patent No 6694471 to Sharp.

- As per claim 9, Sharp discloses a method comprising queuing up a message for retransmission when no receipt acknowledgement is received by the computing system (142, 146). Vaios discloses that the message is an event notification message, as discussed above.
- As per claim 10, Sharp discloses a method additionally comprising retransmitting a message when no receipt acknowledgement is received by the computing system (142, 146). Vaios discloses that the message is an event notification message, as discussed above.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- US Patent No 5752050 to Hernandez et al discloses a system that wakes up when an event is received and which returns to the sleeping state when the event has been fully processed.
- US Patent No 5600576 to Broadwater et al discloses a system that wakes up when triggered by an event and then falls back asleep within 1.5 seconds.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anand Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-7211. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynne Browne can be reached on (571) 272-3670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

THUAN DU